

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

A table of contents for *The Expositor* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_expositor-series-1.php

truth. He sets before us an ideal, a possibility of perfectness, which it is our duty not only to admire but to imitate and realize. This ideal of human nature and perfectness of manhood Jesus, in the passage we are considering, calls the light. The change made in R.V. in *v.* 35 is worthy of note—"Jesus *therefore* said unto them," not as in A.V., "Then Jesus said unto them." Therefore, i.e. in answer to their question, and in order to explain the meaning of "the Son of man." The explanation is conveyed in the words that follow. "Walk while ye have the light, that darkness overtake you not; and he that walketh in the darkness knoweth not whither he goeth." The revelation, then, is of the Son of man, who is Christ our example (1 Peter ii. 21), as the Light that guides—the thought which Newman has so beautifully expressed in the familiar hymn:

Lead, kindly Light, amid the encircling gloom,
 Lead Thou me on;
 The night is dark, and I am far from home;
 Lead Thou me on.

ARTHUR CARR.

THE AMORITE CALENDAR.

It is well known that in early Babylonian times month names are found to have been in use which rarely appear later. The names of the months which are most generally known are those of the native "Babylonian" Calendar, as we may call it here for distinctness. These are in order—Nisânu, Aiâru, Simânu, Du'ûzu, Âbu, Ulûlu, Tišrîtu, Arahsamna, Kislîmu, Tebêtu, Šabâtu and Addaru. It is agreed that the Hebrews borrowed these names in the forms Nisân, Iyyâr, Sîwân, Tammûz, Âb, Elûl, Tišrî, Marhešwân, Kislew, Tebêt, Šebât, and Adâr. The correspondence is very close indeed, and presents some interesting points, such as the

consistent replacement of the *m* by *waw*, the preservation of the same consonants and the length of the vowels. The variations seen in Tammûz for Du'ûzi, Marḥešwân for Arahšamna, and the loss of the *t* in Tišrî deserve notice. We may return to them.

This was not, however, the only calendar in use. The "Babylonian" month names given above are known to be the equivalents of the Sumerian names which may be read, in the same order, as BĀR-ZAG-GAR, GUD-SI-DI, MUR-GU-A, ŠŪ-KUL-A, NE-NE-GAR, KIN-(AN)NINNI, DUL-AZAG, GIŠ-APIN-GAB-A, KAN-KAN-UD-DU, AB-UD-DU, AŠ-A, ŠE-KIN-KUD. This we will call the "Sumerian" Calendar. The abbreviations of these names, BAR, GUD, MURGU, ŠŪ, NE, KIN, DUL, APIN, KAN, AB, AŠ, ŠE, were used in later times as ideograms for the months; so that, for example, *arhu DUL* is to be read *arhu Tišrîtu*. There is no connexion between the "Sumerian" and "Babylonian" names for the same month, beyond a general similarity of meaning in some cases. As a whole, the Babylonian names are not Semitic translations of the Sumerian names.

The "Sumerian" Calendar given above was in use before and down to the close of the third millennium B.C. In still earlier times other Sumerian names for months have been found. Dr. H. Radau, in his *Early Babylonian History*, pp. 287-307, gives a discussion of many of these names, which we will distinguish as "Early Sumerian." In the business documents of the period of the First Dynasty of Babylon, we find in use some of these "Early Sumerian" month names, usually simply the "Sumerian" names, some of the "Babylonian" names, together with a fourth set of Semitic names. It is very interesting to find at such an early date spellings like *A-ia-ri*, *A-ia-ri-im*, *A-ia-ru-um*, *A-ia-rum* for Aiâru, or *E-lu-li* and *E-lu-lu* for Ulûlu. The latter case is

interesting because the Hebrews borrowed that form, not the later Ulûlu.

It is the fourth set with which this paper is chiefly concerned. Mr. L. W. King, in note 3 p. xxxv. of his *Letters and Inscriptions of Hammurabi*, vol. iii., has given a list of these month names, which he reads as Dûr-abi (or aga), Dûr-Rammânu, Elunu, Ĥumtu, Kinunu, Nabru, Sibutu, Rabutu and Tirum, with references to the inscriptions in which they occur. To this list I would add now Mamitu and perhaps Šubutu; possibly Tirinu, if this be not the same as Tirum. It is clear that these are not the same as either the "Babylonian" or "Sumerian" names given above. They form part of a different calendar. Whose calendar was this? It has long been recognized by scholars that the names of the kings of the First Dynasty of Babylon, as well as the names of many of their subjects appearing in contemporary business documents, are neither Babylonian nor Sumerian. Comparisons of these names with Canaanite, Hebrew, or Arabic personal names have led different writers to call the bearers of these names Amorite, Arabic, Canaanite or West Semitic. Dr. H. Ranke, in his *Early Babylonian Personal Names* (Philadelphia, 1905), p. 33, however, calls attention to the fact "that the native Babylonians called these foreign cousins, who had become residents in their country, by the name of *mârê Amurru*," or, as we may say, "Amorites." In using this term, we need not imply that these people were the same in race as the Amorites mentioned in the Holy Scriptures; nor that they were the same as the Amurri of the later Assyrian inscriptions and located by them in Canaan. If the name Amurru designates the same people everywhere, the questions remain to be solved whether these Amorites in Babylonia came from the land of Amurru in Canaan, or whether the Canaanite Amorites came from Babylonia, having first

settled there; or whether both sets of Amorites came separately from some one common home, say in South Arabia. If they came from Canaan, the name Canaanite for the dynasty is partly justified; if from Arabia, we may call it Arabic; the use of the name Amorite need not assume either answer. The name West Semitic is based on linguistic considerations, but when applied to these people seems to imply that they came into Babylonia from the West, which has still to be proved. We shall, therefore, call them Amorites, bearing in mind that their names do show marked likenesses to those of the Semites settled later in Syria, Canaan, Phoenicia, and South Arabia.

To return to the calendar. We have used "Babylonian" and "Sumerian" to denote completely different sets of month names. We have decided to call a third race settled in Babylonia, whose names appear in the same documents with these fresh month names, by the name "Amorite." It is, therefore, tempting to call this the "Amorite Calendar." It can hardly be ascribed to another unknown, unsuspected, unnamed folk.

We may now proceed to inquire whether we can discover the relations between these "Amorite" month names and the "Babylonian" and "Sumerian" months. As Mr. King has already pointed out in his note, referred to above, one document gives Rabûtim on the inner tablet, while the outer case gives the Sumerian *BAR-ZAG-GAR*, which we know to be the Babylonian Nisânu.

There are a number of contracts of the period of the First Dynasty of Babylon which deal with the hire of labourers, or the renting of houses, for fixed terms, usually by the year. Some of these state the month with which the term of service or lease of the house commenced, and the month in which it ended, as well as the full duration of the period. They do this in a way which fixes the order of

the months. It is clear that if a man was hired for a year, beginning, say, with January, he would leave his service at the end of December ; or, if he hired a house for a year, and entered it on the first of July, he would leave it on the last of June. Now the formula used in these contracts is very explicit. It runs like this : *ina arhi X irub, arha Y igammarma uši*, that is, " he entered (the house or service) in the month of X, he shall complete the month of Y and go out (leave the house or service)." The few variants of this formula which occur consist in the presence or absence of the mimmaton, a certain looseness in the use of the cases, and some variations in the verbs. But the conclusion is inevitable, the month Y must have preceded the month X. When, however, by " in the month " was meant some time different from " at the beginning of the month " ; for example, if the house was entered on the fourth of X, the tenant must leave on the third of X next year, twelve months later ; then we may have X and Y the same month.

We may first take an example, where we know both X and Y, to prove that these ancient people reckoned exactly as we do. On the certainty of this depends our whole argument. Here is one of several. A contract, V.A. Th. 766, published by Dr. Meissner in his *Beiträge zum Altbabylonischen Privatrecht* (M.A.P.), No. 70, says of a tenant of a house, *arhi Abu ûm I(KAM) irûb, arha Du'ûzu igammarma uzzi*, " he entered in the month of Âbu, on the first day, he shall complete the month of Du'ûzu and leave." Then Du'ûzu must have preceded Âbu, as we know it did, otherwise.

In a slightly different case, Bu. 91-5-9, 1081, published in the British Museum *Corpus* of inscriptions, *Cuneiform Texts from Babylonian Tablets*, etc., volume vi. [C.T. vi.], p. 41, we read *arhi Elûli ûm I(KAM) irûb, arha KIN-(AN)-NINNI igammilma lizi*, " he entered on the first of Elûlu,

he shall complete the month Ulûlu (Sumerian *KIN-AN-NINNI*) and he may leave." Here it would seem that the term of service was thirteen months, though the labourer was hired for one year, as the document expressly states just previously. We may perhaps suppose that the scribe made a mistake, in calculation or writing, or that Elûlu was not really the same month as Ulûlu. It may have been the Amorite name for the next month.

A somewhat similar case occurs in V.A. Th. 967 [M.A.P., No. 60], where a labourer hired for a year *rêš arhi Kislîmi irûb, arha Kislîma igammarma uzzi*, "he entered at the beginning of Kislîmu, he shall complete Kislîmu and leave." Here either the term of service was really thirteen months or the scribe made a mistake. The mistake in both cases may be the same, it may be that the scribe does not mean that the term should be inclusive of the same month twice, but he has said so here certainly. These are the only two cases known to me where any such doubt arises. The general usage, as in the first example, is that the second month named is the month before that named first.

Now let us see what this method will do for the "Amorite" months. The contract V.A. Th. 974 (and its case 975) [M.A.P., No. 71] says of the tenant of a house, *arhi mâhrû ša Addari ûm I(KAM-MA-NI-E) irûb, Arhi Dûr-Rammânu igammarma ûzi*, "he entered in the month supplementary to Addaru (Ve-Adar), he shall complete the month of Dûr-Rammânu and leave." Thus Dûr-Rammânu preceded Ve-Adar. This introduces a little doubt. Strictly, no doubt, we must conclude that Dûr-Rammânu was the same as Adar, but the scribe may have meant that Dûr-Rammânu preceded Adar, having a normal year in his mind. We shall return to this point later. For other references to Dûr-Rammânu the reader may consult Mr. King's note quoted above. A contract, Bu. 91-5-9, 938,

C.T. vi. 40, says of a labourer hired for a year, *arhi Dûr-Rammânu ûm IV (KAM) irûb, arhim Mamitim igarmarma uzzi*, "he entered on the fourth of Dûr-Rammânu, he shall complete Mamitu and leave." Hence Mamitu preceded Dûr-Rammânu.

Again, another contract, Bu. 91-5-9, 1137 [C.T. vi. 41], says of a man hired for a year, *arhi Elûlu irûb, arhi Tirinu ûzi*, "he entered in Elûlu, he shall leave in Tirinu." Therefore Tirinu preceded Elûlu. Mr. King's note gives three references for a month Tiru. The sign I have read *nu* may be an error for *im*. If so, the name here will be Tiru.

In a contract, S. 564, published by Professor V. Scheil in *Une Saison de fouilles à Sippar*, p. 135, we read of the man hired for a year, *arhi Šubutim ina reštišu idar arha Aiâru igarmarma ussi*, "he shall commence in the month Šubutu, he shall complete the month Aiâru and leave." Hence Aiâru preceded Šubutu. In these texts *ŠU* is often like *SU*. At any rate it is tempting to suppose that Šubutu is the same month as the Sibutu of Mr. King's note, a form which occurs also on Sennacherib's "Bellino" cylinder, and of which another variant given by Mr. King is Zibutu.

If these conclusions be correct, we have now fixed five of the "Amorite" months, viz. Rabûtu is Nisân, Šubûtu (Sibûtu, Zibûtu) is Sîwân, Tiru is Âb (Elûlu being Ulûlu), Mamitu is Šebât, Dûr-Rammânu is Adar. Of the rest Kinûnu looks very like the Aramaic Kanûn, and would then answer to the Babylonian Arahšamna. That some such name for this month was known to the Assyrians is rendered likely by the personal name Kannunai, which would then be a name taken from the month of birth, like Tebêtai, Ulûlai, Adarai, etc.

In support of the likelihood of an "Amorite" month name surviving in Aramaic we may refer to Dr. Ranke's comparison of the "Amorite" personal names with Aramaic names.

The month of Šadutu, Šaddutu, Šandutu, is named in contracts to repay money, lent at various dates, to tide over the expenses of harvest. Here the money is to be repaid *um ebûrim arhim Šadutum*, "on the day of harvest in the month of Šadûtu." It was later than Simânu, the latest of the dates on which this species of loan is recorded, and earlier than Ulûlu, the earliest of such dates. We are, therefore, restricted to Du'ûzu for this month, Âbu being already assigned to Tiru. We even find a loan to harvest corn issued at the beginning of Du'ûzu, to be repaid on the fifteenth day [M.A.P. 15], with which may be compared another such loan to be repaid *ina isin abi*, which may mean "on the feast day of Âbu," or "the festival of Abi," and may have fallen in Šadutu [M.A.P. 14]. Further, we find from a receipt, Bu. 91-5-9 [C.T. viii. 38], that three borrowers of corn had already repaid part of their loan on the twentieth of Du'ûzu. Further evidence that Du'ûzu was then the month of corn harvest need hardly be called for. We may, therefore, conjecture that Šadûtu was the "Amorite" name of the month Tammûz. We may further remark that names like Dûr-Abi, Dûr-Rammânu, are very unlikely for month names; the word *dûru*, "a wall," does not seem likely to be part of such names. Moreover the sign read *dûr* is very liable to be confused with the sign *EZEN*, of which the Semitic value is *isinnu*, "a feast or festival." The sign *EZEN* enters rather often into the "Early Sumerian" month names given by Dr. Radau. The name given by Mr. King in his note is written very like *EZEN-a-bi*, which would then correspond with the *isin abi* quoted above. It seems preferable, therefore, to regard this as a month name and to suppose that the loan was to be repaid in that month. Unless it is another name for Šadutu or Du'ûzu, as Tiru is Âbu, we cannot place it earlier than Ulûlu, and can hardly expect the repayment postponed

much longer. It may be a fuller name for Ābu, as the "Early Sumerian" month names appear to drop the *EZEN*, or *isinnu*, on occasions. This *EZEN*, Dr. Radau thinks, may be the origin of the old Canaanite *Ethanim*, preserved by the Hebrews and found in Phoenician inscriptions (1 Kings viii. 2, *Eshmunazar*, etc.). It is not clear, however, that this would make the month *Isîn-abi* equivalent to *Tiṣrītu* as *Ethanim* seems to have been.

Whether *Zibutu*, which we have made equal to *Sibutu*, *Šubûtu*, is the old Canaanite *Ziv* (1 Kings vi. 37), or the Phoenician *Zib*, is also open to question. The contracts of the First Dynasty present many cases of the interchange of *z* and *s*, and the *šu* in *Šubutu* may be a misreading for *zu* or *su*. Among the "Early Sumerian" names is a *ZIB-KÛ*. More evidence, however, is required before we go further.

An old name for *Simānu* is *Kuṣallu*, which seems to have survived in the Palmyrene *Kaṣlul*. The "Early Sumerian" name for *Du'ûzu* is *(AN)-DUMU-ZI*, which seems to be nearer *Tammûz* than *Du'ûzu*; though, recollecting the interchange of *m* and *waw*, we may suppose that a Babylonian *Dumuzi* was once in use.

On a review of the whole evidence, which rarely amounts to more than suggestion, except as to the equivalence of some seven of the "Amorite" months with the "Babylonian" and "Sumerian" months, we may say that we have some indications that this "Amorite" Calendar left its traces not only in Babylonia and Assyria (down to *Sennacherib's* time), but perhaps also in Canaan. It raises hopes that as the many thousands of unpublished inscriptions of the First Dynasty become available for study, we shall be able to fix other such months as *Nabru*, *Humtu*, or *Šepi* . . ., and determine whether *Elunu* is the same as *Elulu*. We may also, perhaps, find a prototype for *Abib* and *Bûl*, the other Canaanite months known from the Old

Testament, or for the other Phoenician, Aramaic, etc., months known from the inscriptions. We may obtain more light as to the exact value of the term "Amorite" used here. At any rate this unpretending sketch may serve to provoke interest in the subject.

C. H. W. JOHNS.

*NOTES FROM THE LECTURE-ROOM OF
EPICTETUS.¹*

"*I forbid you to go into the senate-house.*" "*As long as I am a senator, go I must.*" Two voices were speaking from one person—the first, pompous, coarse, despotic ; the second, refined, dry, austere. There was nothing that approached stage-acting—only a suggestion of one man swelling out with authority, and of another straightening up his back in resistance. These were the first words that I heard from Epictetus, as I crept late into the lecture-room, tired with a long journey over-night into Nicopolis.

I need not have feared to attract attention. All eyes were fixed on the lecturer as I stole into a place near the door, next my friend Arrian, who was absorbed in his notes. What was it all about ? In answer to my look of inquiry Arrian pushed me his last sheet with the names "Vespasian" and "Helvidius Priscus" scrawled large upon it. Then I knew what it meant. It was a story now nearly forty years old—which I had often heard from an old friend of my father's, Æmilius Scaurus—illustrating the duty of obeying the voice of the conscience rather than the voice of a king. Epictetus, after his manner, was throwing it into the form of a dialogue :—

¹ In the following pages, which form the first chapter of a volume probably to be published before long, all sayings assigned to Epictetus are translated or paraphrased from Arrian's record of his lectures. It has not been thought necessary to insert references or notes, which will come more appropriately in the complete work.